## **EXHIBIT A**

# EXHIBIT A TABLE OF CONTENTS

Name	Exhibit	List of Exhibits
· <del></del>	No.	
Acosta, Cynthia	A-1	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. American Home Products Corporation's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant American Home Products Corporation's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>e. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Supplemental Exhibits to Opposition to Remand</li> <li>f. AHP's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Support of its Motion to Transfer to Section R and/or for Stay of Proceedings Pending Transfer to MDL</li> <li>g. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Supplemental Authorities on Transfer and Stay Issues</li> <li>h. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Second Supplemental Memorandum on Stay Motion</li> <li>i. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Second Supplemental Memorandum on Stay Motion</li> <li>i. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages</li> <li>j. Response to Removal Order</li> <li>k. Motion to Substitute Original Consents to Removal</li> </ul>
Alfonso, Erilda	A-2	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and IncorporatedMemorandum</li> <li>c. Plaintiff's Request for Oral Argument on Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>e. AHP Defendants' Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in Support, for Leave to File Memorandum in Excess of 25 Pages</li> </ul>

ion to
ion to
ion to
ion to
.1011 10
1
lum in
o Remand
•.•
pposition
,
ve to File
ges
w in
tion to
w in
ion to
:
n Support
tion to
lum in
o Remand
nent on
đ
u
d ve to File
ve to File
ve to File

		j. Response to Removal Order
Benquist, Dolores	A-8	a. Notice of Removal
Bonquist, Bololos		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Bergeron, Rosalie	A-9	a. Notice of Removal
Dergeron, Rosane	11.7	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs'
		Motion to Remand
		d. American Home Products Defendants'
	-	Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in
	-	Support, for Leave to File Supplemental
		Exhibits to Opposition to Remand
		e. American Home Products Supplemental
		Memorandum in Support of it's Opposition
		to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Bonvillian, Linda	A-10	a. Notice of Removal
Donvinian, Linua	A-10	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Memorandum in
	1	Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		1
		d. Plaintiff's Request for Oral Argument on  Motion to Remand
		e. American Home Products Defendants'
		Motion, and Incorporated Memorandum in
		Support, For Leave to File Memorandum in
D 1 M-1:	A 11	Excess of 25 Pages
Boudreaux, Melanie	A-11	a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's
		Motion to Remand
D	A 10	a. Notice of Removal
Breaux, Ronald	A-12	b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
D 1 D 1	A 12	
Daigle, Roselyn	A-13	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
	1	c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support

Elstrott, Janice	A-14	of Motion to Remand d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand a. Notice of Removal b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Fabre, Elizabeth	A-15	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Hegeman, Katherine	A-16	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand </li> <li>c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
James, Konnee et al.	A-17	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Kershenstine, Paula	A-18	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand</li> </ul>

Tr: 11 C1 1	T 4 10	NI ('CD1
Kidd, Shavonda	A-19	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
King, Grace et al.	A-20	a. Notice of Removal
	] :	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Logos, Audrey	A-21	a. Notice of Removal
8,,		b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and
•		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Response to Removal Order
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiff's Motion to Remand
Norwood, Elaine Green	A-22	a. Notice of Removal
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	11 22	b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
t T		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Porche, Cynthia	A-23	a. Notice of Removal
Forche, Cynuna	A-23	b. Intervenors' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum
		c. American Home Products Corporation's
		Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		1 **
		d. Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant American
		Home Products Corporation's Opposition to
	1 04	Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Smallwood, Gina	A-24	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and
		Incorporated Memorandum of Law in
		Support of Motion to Remand
		c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
<u> </u>		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
Smith, Alan	A-25	a. Notice of Removal
		b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
		c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support
		of Motion to Remand
		d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to
		Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand
	1	e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in

Smith, Delores	A-26	Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand f. Wyeth's Second Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs Motion to Remand a. Notice of Removal
		<ul> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum</li> <li>c. American Home Products Corporation's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Tapp, Barbara	A-27	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Williams, Bobbie L.	A-28	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>d. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> <li>e. Wyeth's Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Williams, Catherine	A-29	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand</li> </ul>
Womack, Gail M.	A-30	<ul> <li>a. Notice of Removal</li> <li>b. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Incorporated Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Remand</li> <li>c. Wyeth's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand</li> </ul>

### **EXHIBIT B**

			_					_														<u> </u>			-	JC	9				
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																															
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Λ	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ÿ	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Å	Ą	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER	No																					The state of the s									
MDL#	02-21043																									:					
COMPLAINT DATE	12/4/01	-																													
CASE	ACOSTA																														
PLAINTIFE	1. Acosta, Cynthia	2. Adams, Sophia	3. Allen, Gladys	4. Andrews, Mildred	5. Austin, Marenda	6. Bartholomew, Olivia	7. Bates, Kim	8. Benn, Rachelle	9. Bertrand, Sylvia	10. Bonnette, Robert	11. Bonvillian, Linda	12. Bordelon, Donna	13. Boyle, Barbara	14. Brown, Cheryl	15. Brown, Nell	16. Bruno, Michelle	17. Burrell, Morrea	18. Chapoton, Stephanie	19. Charles, Lisa	20. Coleman, Darlene	21. Daniels, Denise	22. Daniels, Elise	23. Danos, Pamela	24. Dor, William Patrick	25. Doyle, Georgia	26. Durand, Jacquelyn	27. Elgin, Gregory	28. Evans, Christine	29. Fassbender, Lolly	30. Fava, Tonya	31. Fentress, Dora

Case	e 2	:0	2-0	CV-	-20	01:	33	-H	В		Do	OCI	um	er	nt	6-2	2		Fil	lec	0 1	4/(	08	/20	00	5		Pa	ıge	9 1	0	of	29	)	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																																			
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Ϋ́	Ā		Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Υ	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å
SEVERANCE ORDER																																			
AINT MDL#						: : : :																										-			
COMPLAINT DATE																					=														
CASE				yes																	enia						je.								ıtha
PLAINTIFF	32. Francis, Beverly	33. Gaines, Brenda	34. Green, Gail	35. Jenson, Gwen Boyes	36. Jones, Litena	37. Kaufman, Connie	38. Klees, Stacey	39. Labatut, Susan	40. Lear, Kathy	41. Lee, Gwendolyn	42. Mallard, Linda	43. Mar, Charleen	44. Maunoir, Rhonda	Labat	45. Mayeaux, Barbara	46. Mayeaux, Donald	47. McCurdy, Terrie	48. McDaniel, Danita	49. McElroy, Paula B.	50. McGee, Doris	51. McKinney, Louvenia	52. McLeod, Kathy	53. Merrick, Ruby	54. Mire, Jay	55. Moran, Kathleen	56. Ned, Martha	57. Nini, Susan Speigel	58. Norris, Cynthia	59. O'Rourk, Irwin	60. Peneguy, Edwin	61. Petticrew, Linda	62. Poceh, Jamieson	63. Rainey, Vernita	64. Ramirez, Brenda	65. Ramogase, Samantha

Case	e 2	:0	2-0	CV-	-20	01:	33	-H	В		Do	OC	um	ner	nt (	6-2	2	Fil	ec	0 1	4/	08	/20	00	5		Pa	ıge	e 1	1	of	29	)	
SALES REP <u>DEFENDANT</u> <u>NAMED?</u>					The state of the s																											The state of the s		
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Ÿ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ϋ́	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Ā			Y	Å	Å	Y	Å	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ	λ	λ			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER																	No																	
							-										02-20135							and the state of t		-								
COMPLAINT DATE																	12/04/01	(Petition for Intervention)				And desired the second												
CASE						and the state of t								in the second se			ALFONSO	INTERVENTION (PEGGY MARTINEZ	ET AL.)															
<b>PLAINTIEK</b>	66. Reed, Regina	67. Robinson, Nicole	68. Roy, Burnett	69. Rushing, Janell	70. Sanmartin, Eva	71. Savoie, Julie	72. Schwan, Rhonda	73. Scott, Jacqueline	74. Silva, Kristen	75. Songy, Roy	76. Stevens, Victoria	77. Turner, Sybil	78. Usey, Kirk	79. Vedros, Lilia	80. Washington, Bernita	81. Williams, Janine	1. Alfonso, Erilda			2. Bracey, Susan	3. Braquet, Betty		5. Bynes, Maura Currera	6. Cardinale, Louis	7. Constant, Gladys	8. Dothy, Gail	1	10. Dufrene, Marion	11. Durapau, Toni L.	12. Eumont, Audrey		14. Galley, Adam	15. Gaudet, Karen	16. Hill, Cynthia

Case 2:02-cv-201	133-HB Docu	ument 6-2	Filed 04/08/2005	Page 12 of 29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?				
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED? Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED? Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	4	X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X
SEVERANCE			PTO 4616	
WDI #			02-20239	
COMPLAINT			8/1/02	
CASE			ARMSTRONG	
PLAINTIFF  17. Karlow, Norma 18. Kemp, Betty B. 19. Kessling, Harold 20. Kirsch, Linda M. 21. Knight, Doma 27. Lassus, Germaine W.		29. Powel, Dianne 30. Rodrigue, Pretissa 31. Sallinger, Nicholas 32. Sanchez, Susan 33. Trosclair, Tonie D. 34. Vacarella, John		<ol> <li>Bell, Lester</li> <li>Birden, Tracy</li> <li>Berkel, Jacqueline</li> <li>Broussard, Aquanell</li> <li>Brown, Edelina M.</li> <li>Burke, Brunnette</li> <li>Buisson, Gloria</li> <li>Causey, Tashia</li> <li>Conerly-Smith, Cathy</li> </ol>

Ca	ise 2	2:0	2-0	CV-	-20	)13	33-	-HI	В		Do	OCI	ım	ner	nt (	6-2	2		Fil	ed	l 0	4/0	)8/	20	05	5	F	Pa	ge	1:	3 0	of 2	29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																					1	Y											
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?													· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									λ	<b>Y</b>  ;	X					Y	X	X	Ā	Y
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	γ	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	γ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	X	X	Y	Å	Y	Å	Y	λ	Y	¥
SEVERANCE ORDER											PTO 4615					11.00000						N/A	PTO 4622		PIO 4621				No				ON.
WDL#				and desired the state of the st							03-20150						:					03-20114	03-20096		02-20244				02-20136				02-20130
COMPLAINT					and the second s						10/01/02											8/30/02	7/12/02		8/7/02				12/4/01				11/30/01
CASE											AUGUST		and the second of the second o								The second secon	BARRIE	BENN		BENQUIST				BERGERON				BONVILLIAN INTERVENTION (ANN FRANZ ET
PLAINTIFF	11. Constant, Patty		13. Crat, Dorothy	14. Craig, Ulylessia	15. Curtis, Kathy	16. Davis, Tammy		18. Galdamez, Tanya	19. Graves, Sharon	20. Green, Evelyn		2. Andrews, Donna		4. Biro, Yvonne	5. Blair, Jacqueline	6. Brown, Elvar M.	7. Davis, Linda S.		9. Burgman, Roxanne	10. Taylor, Kimberly	11. Hottel, Angel O.	- 1	1			2. Chautin, Brenda Lee	3. Sirigne, Stacey	4. Jeter, Sheila	1. Bergeron, Rosalie		3. Rousseau, Kim	4. Smith, Katherine	

Cas	e 2	2:0	2-	CV	-20	01	33	-H	В		D	OC	un	ne	nt	6-2	2		Fi	lec	d 0	4/	80	/2	00	5		Pa	ıge	e 1	4	of	29	1	
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?																																			
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?		Y	Ā	Å	Υ	Y	Ā	Ā	Ÿ	Y	Y	Y			Y	Ā	>		Y												Y				
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	λ	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y		Ā	Y	Y	Y	Λ	Y	Λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER					-		-						PTO 4520		PTO 4618					No											PTO 4619	PTO 4606			
WDF#													02-20133		03-20136					03-20130											02-20134	03-20131			
COMPLAINT													12/4/01		7/16/02					8/01/02											12/4/01	8/29/02			
CASE	AL.)												BOUDREAUX		BREAUX					DAIGLE											ELSTROTT	FABRE			
PLAINTIFF		2. Bartholomew, Olivia			:	ĺ	7. Hodes, Howard	8. O'Rourk, Irwin	9. Robinson, Nicole	10. Roy, Burnett	11. Songy, Roy L.	12. Vedros, Lilia	1. Boudreaux, Melanie	2. Scott, Darlene		2. Robertson, Adriena	3. Davenport,	Gwendolyn	4. Normand, Margie	1. Daigle, Roselyn et al	2. Marshal, Trudy	3. Reyes, Judy		5. Fourcade, Elinor	6. Frederick, Cheryl	7. Harris, Jackson, Sr.	8. Danos, Timothy		10. Tredanari, Betsy Berry	11. Meggs, Tonya	1. Elstrott, Janice	1. Fabre, Elizabeth et al		3. Phillips, Patricia	4. Peterson, Patrick

Case 2:02-cv-20133-HB										Do	OC	um	nei	nt	6-2	2	Filed 04/08/2005									Page 15 of 29							
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?									Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	γ													Ā						
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?				Control of the contro					The state of the s				The state of the s															Ā	Y	Y	Å	Y	The second secon
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED? Y	¥	X	Y	Y	Λ	Λ	Λ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SEVERANCE ORDER									PTO 4607						PTO 4599												N/A	PTO 4597					No
<u>MDL #</u>	The second secon								03-20151						03-20064												03-20169	02-20224					03-20132
COMPLAINT DATE				The state of the s		and the second s			11/7/02			100 11 11 11			10/8/02							The second secon			The second secon		11/07/03	7/16/02					10/29/02
CASE									HEGEMAN						JAMES												KERSHENSTINE	KIDD					KING
PLAINTIFF  S. Rogers. Wade E.				9. Bersuder, Caren M.	10. Domino, Joann M.	11. Sandras, Linda G.	12. Orsin, Carolyn	13. Harrell, Marilyn	1. Hegeman, Katherine	2. Hegeman, Doris	3. Yuratich, Debbie	4. Langston, Mary		6. Mecom, Deborah	1. James, Konnee et al	2. McCorkle, Jacqueline E.	3. Plaisance, Joan		1		7. Wood, Margaret	8. Small, Jerome	9. Preen, Mary D.	10. Williams, Bobbie	11. Shipley, Denise	12. Bonilla, Jody	1. Kershenstine, Paula	1. Kidd, Shavonda	2. Johnson, Mildred	١.	1		1. King, Grace et al.

Case 2:02-cv-20133-h	HB Doc	cument 6-2	Filed 04/08/2005	5 Page 16 of 29
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAWED?		Y		
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?				¥
PHENTERMINE  DEFENDANT  NAMED?  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y	X X	X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X
SEVERANCE ORDER		N/A PTO 4611		No
WDF#		04-02132		02-20131
COMPLAINT DATE		7/6/04		12/4/01
CASE		LOGOS NORWOOD		PORCHE INTERVENTION (CATHY
2. Kightell, Debra 3. Robert, James J. Jr. 4. Riley, Danny Ferrill 5. Recasner, Lisa 6. Ragas, Beverly N. 7. Taylore, Lula Mae (estate of) 8. Vorna, Paula		<ul><li>12. Morgan, Valerie</li><li>13. Meza, Lourdes</li><li>1. Logos, Audrey</li><li>1. Norwood, Elaine</li><li>Green</li></ul>		10. Rankin, Regina 11. Edwards, Shirley 12. Stewart, Ruby 13. Mitchell, Kermit 14. Scott, Elaine 15. Jones, Elaine 16. Taquino, Thomas 1. Porche, Cynthia

Case 2	se 2:02-cv-20133-HB										Document 6-2									Filed 04/08/2005 Page 1										17 of 29				
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?			Y	Y	Y	A	Å	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ā	Y		Y											del finale (Marie )							
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?	Ā	Y																										¥			λ			
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Ÿ	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y		Y	Ϋ́	Y			Å			
SEVERANCE ORDER			PTO 4610														PTO 4614											No						
MDL#			03-20430			: 5											03-20139											02-20135						
COMPLAINT DATE			7/7/03														8/29/02											11/27/01	(Anderson)					
CASE CHERAMIE ET AL.)			SMALLWOOD														SMITH, A.											SMITH	INTERVENTION	ANDERSON ET AL.)				
PLAINTIFE	2. Guidry, Cheryl	1	1. Smallwood, Gina	2. Labiche, William	3. Pumila, Joann	4. Somme, Jenne	1	1	]		1	ا		12. Dusenbury, Timothy	- 1	13. Mattingly, Carolyn	1. Smith, Alan	2. Sapp, Clinton	İ		5. Dagons, S.	6. Rosenthal-Tucker, Cynthia	7. Denison, Mary E.	8. Mones-Woodruff,	Ruthie	9. Dauterive, Ronald	10. Chittenden, Roberta	1. Smith, Delores T.			2. Williams, Cynthia			

Cas	e 2	2:0	2-	CV <sup>-</sup>	-20	01:	33	-H	В		D	OC	un	nei	nt	6-2	2		Fil	lec	0 1	4/	08	/20	00	5		Pa	ıge	e 1	8 of 2	9
SALES REP DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	Å	X	
PHYSICIAN DEFENDANT NAMED?																																
PHENTERMINE DEFENDANT NAMED?	Y	Y	Y	Υ	Y	Y	$\Lambda$	$\Lambda$	Ā	Ā	Å	Y	Ā	Y	Ā	Ā	Ā	Ā	Α	Ā	Y	Ā	Y	Y	Y	Y	$\lambda$	Ā	Ā	Ā		
SEVERANCE ORDER	PTO 4613	3										PTO 4609	-					PTO 4605													N/A	
MDL#	03-20115											04-29780						03-20194													03-20549	
COMPLAINT DATE	11/22/02											10/11/02						2/11/03													8/29/03	
CASE	TAPP											WILLIAMS, B.						WILLIAMS, C.													WOMACK	
<u>PLAINTIFF</u>	1. Tapp, Barbara	2. Hammler, Alice	3. Hoofkin, Shalanda		5. Lemoine, Ellen	6. Tember, Aselina	7. Palmer, Peggy	8. Walker, Michelle	9. Hills, Margaret	10. Johnson, Sharon	11. Thomas, Diane	1. Williams, Bobbie L.	2. Lovoi-Robin, Lolita	3. Meyers, Arthur	4. Sercovich, Shaun	5. Cochrane, Laurence	١.		2. Hebert, John		4. Prudeaux-Hill, Marva			7. McGee, Sherry	8. Jeffrey, Roland P., Jr.		10. Franklin, James	11. Harkless, Ruby	12. Heffer, Glynn	ì		

## **EXHIBIT C**

Before me, a notary public in and for said County and State, personally appeared Vicki Kilchine. who being by me duly sworn, deposes on oath and says:

- My name is Vicki Kilcline. I am over the age of cighteen years and make this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge.
- Thave been employed by Wyeth, formerly known as American Home Products Corporation; since 1987. From approximately 1990 until 2002, I held the position of area account director. From 2002 until the present, I have held the position of area account manager.
- While Redux was on the market, I never visited any private healthcare provider or supervised any Wyeth sales representative or area account manager who visited any private the second secon healthcare provider. During that time, my responsibility was to call on academic teaching. accounts and supervise Wyeth employees who were responsible for academic reaching accounts.
- I never advertised, assembled, created, designed, detailed, distributed, labeled, made, manufactured, marketed, packaged, promoted, sold, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Pondimin or the few-phen combination (fenfluramine-phentermine) or trained anyone to do so. 1 never left samples of Pondimin with any healthcare provider. No one I have supervised as part of my responsibilities for Wyoth ever advertised, created, designed, detailed, labeled, made, the second of th manufactured, marketed, packaged, promoted, sold, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Pondimin or the fen-phen combination. Thad no involvement in the development or preparation of package inserts for Pondimin and had no control over the content of those inserts or over other written warnings related to that drug. I did not answer questions from doctors about Pondimin

and I never promoted that drug. Indeed, I had no reason to promote Pondimin because I received no credit, commission, or bonus based on Pondimin sales.

- I never assembled, created, designed, distributed, labeled, made, manufactured, packaged, sterilized, supplied, tested, or warranted Redux, or trained anyone to do so. I never left samples of Redux with any healthcare provider. I had no involvement in the development or preparation of package inserts for Redux; and had no control over the content of those inserts or over other written warnings related to that drug.
- 6. As part of my duties, I provided licensed healthcare providers with FDA-approved informational materials about Redux. I also trained the Wyeth sales representatives I supervised to provide licensed healthcare providers with FDA-approved materials about Redux. My knowledge of Redux was derived exclusively from education provided to me by Wyeth. Wyeth provided me with the FDA-approved package insert and other information regarding Redux.
- I was not aware of any alleged association between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease until the time such an allegation was first publicized. I was not aware before that time of any study, report or other literature which claimed that an association exists between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease or that anyone bad alleged such an association. I was not aware of any information in Wyeth's possession concerning such an association. Thus, I could not have informed doctors or diet drug users of any alleged association between Pondimin and/or Redux and valvular heart disease. I never intentionally misrepresented the safety, efficacy or state of testing of Pondimin or Redux alone or in combination with phentermine to any licensed healthcare providen or to any diet drug user.

- 8. I am not a medical doctor or pharmacist. I have no specialized medical or pharmacological education, except what I received from Wyeth.
- I was not expected, as area account director or area account manager, to conduct independent research regarding the drugs I detailed, and did not do so. I was not expected to, and did not, review independent scientific studies published in journals unless they were supplied to me by Wyeth.
- 10. At no time have I ever distributed or supplied the dier dings Redux, Pondimin, or phentermine to healthcare providers, pharmacies, or anyone else.
- I made no representations regarding Pondimin. Redux: phentermine, or the "fen-phent" combination; whether by way of promotion or advertising or otherwise to the general public.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

day of HAM 2

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: AF JULL

### **EXHIBIT D**

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# DEC 2:2 2003 ROBERT HORESWELL CLERK

#### WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

#### LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

URSURA WESTBROOK, ET VIR.

DOCKET NO. 03-1918

VS.

JUDGE MINALDI

WYETH, ET AL.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILSON

#### REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the court is plaintiffs' Motion to Remand [doc. # 12].

#### Background

On September 12, 2003, Ussura Westbrook and Donald Westbrook filed the instant suit in the 14th Judicial District Court for the Parish of Calcasien, State of Louisiana. Made defendants were: Wyeth, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown. The petition alleges that Ussura Westbrook suffered severe injury to her heart valves due to her use of prescription diet drugs, dexfendiumnine ("redux") and/or fendiumnine ("pondium"), that were manufactured or promoted by defendants. (Petition, ¶ 11-13, 84, 87).

On October 17, 2003, Wyeth removed the case to federal court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Plaintiffs are Louisiana citizens. (Notice of Removal, 15). Wyeth is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in New Jersey. Id. at 16. However, individual defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, are citizens of Louisiana for purposes of diversity. Id. at 17. To circumvent the obvious lack of diversity

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The motion has been referred to the undersigned for decision pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).

between plaintiffs and the individual defendants, Wyeth alleged in its notice of removal that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against the non-diverse parties; and thus, their presence should be disregarded for purposes of determining diversity (i.e. "fraudulent joinder"). Id. Plaintiffs disagree with Wyeth's assessment of their claims against Wicks and Brown. Accordingly, on November 13, 2003, the Westbrooks filed the instant motion to remand alleging lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to incomplete diversity. 28 U.S.C. § 1332.2

On November 17, 2003, the undersigned issued a minute entry notifying the parties that if the court found that plaintiffs had reasonable possibility of recovery against Michael I. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, then summary judgment would be recommended sua sponte in favor of said defendants. Parties were invited to file any additional briefs and/or competent summary judgment evidence addressing the relevant issue(s). The delays have expired, and the matter is now before the court.

#### Frandulent Jonder

Once a case has been removed, the burden lies with the removing party to prove that the court has jurisdiction to decide the claim. Jernigan v. Ashland Oil Inc. 989 F.2d 812, 815 (5th Cir. 1993)(citing, Dodson v. Spiliada Maritime Corp., 951 F.2d 40, 42 (5th Cir. 1992)). If jurisdiction is alleged on the basis that non-diverse parties have been fraudulently joined, then the removing party must establish either: "actual fraud in the pleading of jurisdictional facts," or "an inability of the plaintiff to establish a cause of action against the non-diverse party in state court."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Plaintiff does not contest that the amount in controversy exceeds the requisite jurisfictional minimum. See, 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Moreover, we have reviewed plaintiff's allegations and the Notice of Removal. We are satisfied that plaintiff's claims exceed the jurisdictional minimum.

Travis v. Irby, 326 F.3d 644 (5th Cir. 2003)(citing, Griggs v. State Farm Lloyds, 181 F.3d 694, 698 (5th Cir. 1999)). Here, Wyeth does not dispute that Wicks and Brown are Louisiana citizens. Accordingly, our focus is the second basis for fraudulent joinder. See, Travis, supra. In resolving this issue, we must determine,

> whether [plaintiff] has any possibility of recovery against the party whose joinder is questioned. If there is arguably a reasonable basis for predicting that the state law might impose liability on the facts involved, then there is no fraudulent joinder. This possibility, however, must be reasonable, not merely theoretical.

Travis, supra (quoting, Great Plains Trust Co. v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter & Co., 313 F.3d 305, 312 (5th Cir. 2002)(emphasis added; internal citation and quotations omitted)).

The district courts may "pierce the pleadings" and entertain summary judgment-type evidence; but we must also consider "all unchallenged factual allegations" in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. Travis, supra. Any contested issues of fact and ambiguities of state law must be resolved in favor of remand. Id.

#### Discussion

Plaintiffs allege that Wicks and Brown were Wyeth sales representatives who promoted Pondimin and/or Redux diet drugs to physicians. (Petition, ¶84). Plaintiffs further allege that Wicks and Brown knowingly provided misleading and false information regarding the safety of Pondimin and/or Redux. Id. These acts contributed to plaintiffs' damages. Id.

In its opposition to remand, Wyeth adduced a copy of a "Blue Form" wherein Ussura Westbrook indicated under penalty of perjury that she was only prescribed, and only consumed Pondimin. (Def. Exh. Q). However, Wicks and Brown never promoted Pondimin. (Def. Exhs. R & S). They also did not leave samples with the physicians. Id. Furthermore, Wicks and Brown were not aware of any association between Pondimin and Redux and valvular heart

disease until it was first publicized by the media in September 1997. Id. In sum, Wicks and Brown did not breach any duty owed to plaintiffs which could have caused their damages. See generally, Mundy v. Dept. of Health & Human Res., 620 So.2d 811, 813 (La. 1993).

Accordingly, the uncontroverted evidence establishes that plaintiffs do not have a reasonable possibility of recovery against the individual defendants. Having found that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against the non-diverse defendants, their presence must be disregarded for purposes of determining diversity. The remaining parties (plaintiffs and Wyeth) are completely diverse. We may properly exercise subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

As noted by the Fifth Circuit, "[s]mmnary judgment will always be appropriate in favor of a defendant against whom there is no possibility of recovery." Carriere v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 893 F.2d 98, 102 (5th Cir.1990). We have found that plaintiffs have no reasonable possibility of recovery against defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown. Accordingly, it is appropriate to enter summary judgment in favor of said defendants, dismissing with

We further observe that the only duty owed by detailmen is to deliver and explain the new package inserts to the physicians in their tearitory. Wallace v. Upjohn Co., 535 So.2d 1110 (La. App. 1st Cir. 1988), writ denied, 539 So.2d 630 (La. 1989). However, plaintiffs' petition is devoid of any specific allegations that the detailmen failed to provide the product insert to her physician(s) or that they failed to explain the product insert. See, Griggs v. State Farm Lloyds, 181 F.3d 694, 699 (5st Cir. 1999)(a petition which fails to state any specific actionable conduct on the part of a non-diverse defendant does not satisfy the liberalized requirements of notice pleading such as to state a valid cause of action). Thus, on its face, plaintiffs' petition does not state a cause of action against the non-diverse defendants.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Donald Westhrook's loss of consortium claim is derivative of Ursura Westbrook's claim; and disposition of the latter claim compels the same disposition of the former. See, Dumas v. Angus Chemical Co., 728 So.2d 441, 452 (La. App. 2d Cir. 1999); Benavides v. County of Wilson, 955 F.2d 968, 975 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).

prejudice plaintiffs' claims against them.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS RECOMMENDED that plaintiffs' motion to remand [doc. #12] be DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that judgment be entered in favor of defendants, Michael J. Wicks, and Kevin S. Brown, dismissing with prejudice plaintiffs' claims against said defendants only.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C), the parties have ten (10) business days from receipt of this Report and Recommendation to file any objections with the Clerk of Court. Timely objections will be considered by the district judge prior to a final ruling.

FAILURE TO FILE WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN (10) BUSINESS DAYS FROM THE DATE OF ITS SERVICE SHALL BAR AN AGGRIEVED PARTY FROM ATTACKING ON APPEAL, EXCÉPT UPON GROUNDS OF PLAIN ERROR, THE UNOBJECTED-TO PROPOSED FACTUAL FINDINGS AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS ACCEPTED BY THE DISTRICT COURT.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Lake Charles, Louisiana, this

December, 2003.

ES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FEB - 2 2004

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

#### LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

URSURA WESTBROOK, ET VIR.

DOCKET NO. 03-1918

VS.

JUDGE MINALDI

wyeth, et al.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILSON

#### JUDGMENT

For the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge previously filed herein and after an independent review of the record, and a de novo determination of the issues, and consideration of the objections filed herein, and having determined that the findings are correct under applicable law,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion to remand [doc. # 12] be, and it is hereby DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that judgment be, and it is hereby entered in favor of defendants, MICHAEL J. WICKS, and KEVIN S. BROWN, dismissing with prejudice plaintiffs, URSURA WESTBROOK and DONALD WESTBROOK's claims against said defendants only.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Lake Charles, Louisiana, this 2\_ day

UNRIED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

TUE 13:37 [TX/RX NO 8267] 2001 02/03/04